

Exhibit 300: Capital Asset Plan and Business Case Summary

Part I: Summary Information And Justification (All Capital Assets)

Section A: Overview

1. **Date of Submission:** 2010-09-20

2. **Agency:** 429

3. **Bureau:** 00

4. **Name of this Investment:** Reactor Program System (RPS)

5. **Unique Project (Investment) Identifier (UPI):** 429-00-01-03-01-2000-00

6. **What kind of investment will this be in FY 2012?:** Operations and Maintenance

- Planning
- Full Acquisition
- Operations and Maintenance
- Mixed Life Cycle
- Multi-Agency Collaboration

7. **What was the first budget year this investment was submitted to OMB?** FY2001 or earlier

8.

- a. **Provide a brief summary of the investment and justification, including a brief description of how this closes in part or in whole an identified agency performance gap, specific accomplishments expected by the budget year and the related benefit to the mission, and the primary beneficiary(ies) of the investment.**

RPS provides NRC headquarters and regions capability to build, schedule, and conduct inspection activities for the Reactor Oversight Process (ROP). RPS is used to plan and report on inspections at power plants, decommissioning reactors, fuel facilities, and independent spent fuel facilities. RPS includes plant performance indicators, inspection follow up items, NRC staff data, facility characteristics, and other reactor regulatory data. NRC managers use RPS reports to evaluate effectiveness and uniformity of NRC reactor regulatory programs, critical to protection of public health and safety. RPS data supports NRC safety goals, improving information and quality of decision making related to nuclear power reactor facilities. RPS data is publically available on the external NRC web site. NRC performance goals are ensured through scheduling, conducting, and reporting on inspection activities. RPS oversight responds to changes in regulations for identified safety concerns. RPS also supports event reporting and incident response activities. RPS supports three programs which have been assessed using OMB's PART: Reactor Inspection and Performance Assessment, Reactor Licensing, and Fuel Facility Licensing and Inspection. Accomplishments expected during 2010 include publication of reactor data (Open Gov Initiative); timely response to regulatory changes and system modifications; 98% operational systems availability; over 300 user Help Desk requests completed; added functionality through Change Requests; software version upgrades and "green" security scorecard; RPS vulnerabilities (POA&Ms) closed; integration of offline reporting into RPS; refresh assessment of RPS older client server technologies. During 2012, RPS plans to continue as a steady state investment and respond to business and user Change Requests. The on-going Open Gov Initiative will continue to expand and publish additional reactor data. RPS will continue platform refresh to address aging client server technology concerns. RPS is an internal agency system and the primary RPS beneficiaries include the agency regulatory staff. RPS is critical to the agency safety mission of ensuring the public is adequately protected; the overall beneficiaries include a wide range of external stakeholders (licensees, Federal partners, States, local governments, public).

- b. **Provide any links to relevant websites that would be useful to gain additional information on the investment including links to GAO and IG reports.**

Title	Link
NONE	

9.

- a. **Provide the date of the Agency's Executive/Investment Committee approval of this investment.**
2010-08-31
- b. **Provide the date of the most recent or planned approved project charter.** 2010-08-13

10. **Contact information?**

- a. **Program/Project Manager Name:** *
Phone Number: *
Email: *
- b. **Business Function Owner Name (i.e. Executive Agent or Investment Owner):** Eric Leeds
Phone Number: *
Email: *

11. What project management qualifications does the Project Manager have? (choose only one per FAC-P/PM or DAWIA): Project manager has been validated according to FAC-P/PM or DAWIA criteria as qualified for this investment.

- Project manager has been validated according to FAC-P/PM or DAWIA criteria as qualified for this investment.
- Project manager qualifications according to FAC-P/PM or DAWIA criteria is under review for this investment.
- Project manager assigned to investment, but does not meet requirements according to FAC-P/PM or DAWIA criteria.
- Project manager assigned but qualification status review has not yet started.
- No project manager has yet been assigned to this investment.

Section B: Summary of Funding (Budget Authority for Capital Assets)

1.

Table I.B.1: Summary of Funding

(In millions of dollars)

(Estimates for BY+1 and beyond are for planning purposes only and do not represent budget decisions)

	PY-1 and earlier	PY 2010	CY 2011 (CY Continuing Resolution)	BY 2012	BY+1 2013	BY+2 2014	BY+3 2015	BY+4 and beyond	Total
Planning:	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Acquisition:	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Planning & Acquisition Government FTE Costs	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Subtotal Planning & Acquisition(DME):	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Operations & Maintenance:	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Disposition Costs (optional):	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Operations, Maintenance, Disposition Government FTE Costs	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Subtotal O&M and Disposition Costs (SS):	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
TOTAL FTE Costs	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
TOTAL (not including FTE costs):	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
TOTAL (including FTE costs):	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Number of FTE represented by	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*

Table I.B.1: Summary of Funding
(In millions of dollars)

(Estimates for BY+1 and beyond are for planning purposes only and do not represent budget decisions)

	PY-1 and earlier	PY 2010	CY 2011 (CY Continuing Resolution)	BY 2012	BY+1 2013	BY+2 2014	BY+3 2015	BY+4 and beyond	Total
Costs:									

2. Insert the number of years covered in the column “PY-1 and earlier”: 13

3. Insert the number of years covered in the column “BY+4 and beyond”: *

4. If the summary of funding has changed from the FY 2011 President’s Budget request, briefly explain those changes:

*

Section C: Acquisition/Contract Strategy (All Capital Assets)

1.

Table I.C.1 Contracts Table

Contract Status	Contracting Agency ID	Procurement Instrument Identifier (PIID)	Indefinite Delivery Vehicle (IDV) Reference ID	Solicitation ID	Alternative financing	EVM Required	Ultimate Contract Value (M)	Type of Contract/Task Order (Pricing)	Is the contract a Performance Based Service Acquisition (PBSA)?	Effective date	Actual or expected End Date of Contract/Task Order	Extent Completed	Short description of acquisition
Awarded	3100	DR3306317	GS35F0229K		*	*	\$0.1	Time and Materials	Y	2006-12-08	2011-07-30	N	Modification
Awarded	3100	DR3307358	GS35F4524G		*	*	\$1.2	Labor Hours	Y	2007-09-26	2012-03-24	N	Maintenance & Operation of NRC Systems

2. If earned value is not required or will not be a contract requirement for any of the contracts or task orders above, explain why:

*

3.

- a. Has an Acquisition Plan been developed? If yes, please answer the questions that follow *
- b. Does the Acquisition Plan reflect the requirements of FAR Subpart 7.1 *
- c. Was the Acquisition Plan approved in accordance with agency requirements *
- d. If "yes," enter the date of approval? *
- e. Is the acquisition plan consistent with your agency Strategic Sustainability Performance Plan? *
- f. Does the acquisition plan meet the requirements of EOs 13423 and 13514? *
- g. If an Acquisition Plan has not been developed, provide a brief explanation.

*

Part II: IT Capital Investments

Section A: General

1.
 - a. Confirm that the IT Program/Project manager has the following competencies: configuration management, data management, information management, information resources strategy and planning, information systems/network security, IT architecture, IT performance assessment, infrastructure design, systems integration, systems life cycle, technology awareness, and capital planning and investment control. yes
 - b. If not, confirm that the PM has a development plan to achieve competencies either by direct experience or education.

2. Describe the progress of evaluating cloud computing alternatives for service delivery to support this investment. nrc evaluated its major investments for suitability for migration to cloud technologies and identified potential candidates. examples include cfs, cas, and fees. at this time, rps was not identified as a "must move" service.

3. Provide the date of the most recent or planned Quality Assurance Plan 2010-08-13

4.
 - a. Provide the UPI of all other investments that have a significant dependency on the successful implementation of this investment.
429-00-01-01-01-2030-00,429-00-01-01-01-2025-00,429-00-01-01-01-2016-00,429-00-01-01-01-1100-00,429-00-01-03-01-2080-00
 - b. If this investment is significantly dependent on the successful implementation of another investment(s), please provide the UPI(s). 429-00-01-01-02-1005-00

5. An Alternatives Analysis must be conducted for all Major Investments with Planning and Acquisition (DME) activities and evaluate the costs and benefits of at least three alternatives and the status quo. The details of the analysis must be available to OMB upon request. Provide the date of the most recent or planned alternatives analysis for this investment. 2010-07-28

6. Risks must be actively managed throughout the lifecycle of the investment. The Risk Management Plan and risk register must be available to OMB upon request. Provide the date that the risk register was last updated. 2010-08-13

Section B: Cost and Schedule Performance

Table II.B.1. Comparison of Actual Work Completed and Actual Costs to Current Approved Baseline:

Description of Activity	DME or SS	Agency EA Transition Plan Milestone Identifier	Planned Cost (\$M)	Actual Cost (\$M)	Planned Start Date	Actual Start Date	Planned Completion Date	Actual Completion Date	Planned Percent Complete	Actual Percent Complete
Planning for RPS	DME	*	\$0.0	\$0.0	1996-01-01	1997-01-01	1997-09-30	1997-09-30	100.00%	100.00%
Acquisition of RPS	DME	*	\$2.7	\$2.7	1997-10-01	1997-10-01	2001-05-01	2001-05-01	100.00%	100.00%
Maintenance and Operations thru FY 2001	SS	*	\$1.5	\$1.5	1998-03-01	1998-03-08	2001-09-30	2001-09-30	100.00%	100.00%
Maintenance and Operations FY 2002	SS	*	\$0.8	\$0.8	2001-10-01	2001-10-01	2002-09-30	2002-09-30	100.00%	100.00%
Maintenance and Operations FY 2003	SS	*	\$0.8	\$0.8	2002-10-01	2002-10-01	2003-09-30	2003-09-30	100.00%	100.00%
Maintenance and Operations FY 2004	SS	*	\$0.8	\$0.8	2003-10-01	2003-10-01	2004-09-30	2004-09-30	100.00%	100.00%
Maintenance and Operations FY 2005	SS	*	\$0.9	\$0.9	2004-10-01	2004-10-01	2005-09-30	2005-09-30	100.00%	100.00%
Maintenance and Operations FY 2006	SS	*	\$1.1	\$1.1	2005-10-01	2005-10-01	2006-09-30	2006-09-30	100.00%	100.00%
Maintenance and Operations FY 2007	SS	*	\$1.2	\$1.2	2006-10-01	2006-10-01	2007-09-30	2007-09-30	100.00%	100.00%
Maintenance and Operations FY 2008	SS	*	\$1.3	\$1.3	2007-10-01	2007-10-01	2008-09-30	2008-09-30	100.00%	100.00%
Maintenance and Operations FY 2009	SS	*	\$1.1	\$1.4	2008-10-01	2008-10-01	2009-09-30	2009-09-30	100.00%	100.00%
Maintenance and Operations FY 2010	SS	*	\$1.3	\$1.2	2009-10-01	2009-10-01	2010-09-30	2010-09-30	100.00%	100.00%

Table II.B.1. Comparison of Actual Work Completed and Actual Costs to Current Approved Baseline:

Description of Activity	DME or SS	Agency EA Transition Plan Milestone Identifier	Planned Cost (\$M)	Actual Cost (\$M)	Planned Start Date	Actual Start Date	Planned Completion Date	Actual Completion Date	Planned Percent Complete	Actual Percent Complete
Contingency Plan Testing FY2010	SS	*	\$0.0	\$0.0	2009-10-01	2010-03-26	2010-09-30	2010-09-30	100.00%	100.00%
Security Control Self Assessment FY2010	SS	*	\$0.0	\$0.0	2009-10-01	2009-10-01	2010-09-30	2010-09-17	100.00%	100.00%
Maintenance and Operations FY 2011	SS	*	\$1.8	\$0.6	2010-10-01	2010-10-01	2011-09-30		50.00%	50.00%
Contingency Plan Testing FY2011	SS	*	\$0.0	\$0.0	2010-10-01	2010-10-01	2011-09-30	2011-03-11	100.00%	100.00%
Security Control Self Assessment FY2011	SS	*	\$0.0	\$0.0	2010-10-01	2010-10-01	2011-09-30		90.00%	90.00%
3 Year ATO Re-certification FY 2011	SS	*	*	*	2011-05-01	*	2011-11-08	*	*	*
Maintenance and Operations FY 2012	SS	*	*	*	2011-10-01	*	2012-09-30	*	*	*
Contingency Plan Testing FY2012	SS	*	*	*	2011-10-01	*	2012-09-30	*	*	*
Security Control Self Assessment FY2012	SS	*	*	*	2011-10-01	*	2012-09-30	*	*	*
Maintenance and Operations FY 2013	SS	*	*	*	2012-10-01	*	2013-09-30	*	*	*
Contingency Plan Testing FY2013	SS	*	*	*	2012-10-01	*	2013-09-30	*	*	*
Security Control Self Assessment FY2013	SS	*	*	*	2012-10-01	*	2013-09-30	*	*	*
Maintenance and Operations FY 2014	SS	*	*	*	2013-10-01	*	2014-09-30	*	*	*

Table II.B.1. Comparison of Actual Work Completed and Actual Costs to Current Approved Baseline:

Description of Activity	DME or SS	Agency EA Transition Plan Milestone Identifier	Planned Cost (\$M)	Actual Cost (\$M)	Planned Start Date	Actual Start Date	Planned Completion Date	Actual Completion Date	Planned Percent Complete	Actual Percent Complete
Contingency Plan Testing FY2014	SS	*	*	*	2013-10-01	*	2014-09-30	*	*	*
Security Control Self Assessment FY2014	SS	*	*	*	2013-10-01	*	2014-09-30	*	*	*
3 Year ATO Re-certification FY 2014	SS	*	*	*	2014-05-01	*	2014-11-08	*	*	*
Maintenance and Operations FY 2015	SS	*	*	*	2014-10-01	*	2015-09-30	*	*	*
Contingency Plan Testing FY2015	SS	*	*	*	2014-10-01	*	2015-09-30	*	*	*
Security Control Self Assessment FY2015	SS	*	*	*	2014-10-01	*	2015-09-30	*	*	*
Maintenance and Operations FY 2016	SS	*	*	*	2015-10-01	*	2016-09-30	*	*	*
Contingency Plan Testing FY2016	SS	*	*	*	2015-10-01	*	2016-09-30	*	*	*
Security Control Self Assessment FY2016	SS	*	*	*	2015-10-01	*	2016-09-30	*	*	*

2. If the investment cost, schedule, or performance variances are not within 10 percent of the current baseline, provide a complete analysis of the reasons for the variances, the corrective actions to be taken, and the most likely estimate at completion. Investment is on schedule and under budget. No corrective actions needed.

3. For mixed lifecycle or operations and maintenance investments an Operational Analysis must be performed annually. Operational analysis may identify the need to redesign or modify an asset by identifying previously undetected faults in design, construction, or installation/integration, highlighting whether actual operation and maintenance costs vary significantly from budgeted costs, or documenting that the asset is failing to meet program requirements. The details of the analysis must be available to OMB upon request. Insert the date of the most recent or planned operational analysis.

2010-08-13

4. Did the Operational analysis cover all 4 areas of analysis: Customer Results, Strategic and Business Results, Financial Performance, and Innovation?

yes

Section C: Financial Management Systems

Table II.C.1: Financial Management Systems			
System(s) Name	System acronym	Type of Financial System	BY Funding
*	*	*	*

Section D: Multi-Agency Collaboration Oversight (For Multi-Agency Collaborations only)

Table II.D.1. Customer Table:	
Customer Agency	Joint exhibit approval date
NONE	

Table II.D.2. Shared Service Providers		
Shared Service Provider (Agency)	Shared Service Asset Title	Shared Service Provider Exhibit 53 UPI (BY 2011)
*	*	*

Table II.D.3. For IT Investments, Partner Funding Strategies (\$millions):							
Partner Agency	Partner exhibit 53 UPI (BY 2012)	CY Monetary Contribution	CY “In-Kind” Contribution	CY Fee-for-Service	BY Monetary Contribution	BY “In-Kind” Contribution	BY Fee-for-Service
NONE							

Table II.D.4. Legacy Systems Being Replaced		
Name of the Legacy Investment of Systems	Current UPI	Date of the System Retirement
*	*	*

Section E: Performance Information

Table I.E.1a. Performance Metric Attributes

Measurement Area (For IT Assets)	Measurement Grouping (For IT Assets)	Measurement Indicator	Reporting Frequency	Unit of Measure	Performance Measure Direction	Baseline	Year Baseline Established for this measure (Origination Date)
Customer Results	Service Availability	Availability of RPS during normal working hours (7:30 AM - 5:00 PM EST) to provide access to the data.	annual	Percent	Increase	The RPS is available to users 95% of the time	2005-10-01
			Fiscal Year	Target	Actual Results	Target "Met" or "Not Met"	Last Updated
			2009	The RPS is available to users 95% of the time	RPS was available to users 97% of the time	Met	2010-09-17
			2010	The RPS is available to users 95% of the time	RPS was available to users 97% of the time	Met	2011-02-18
			2011	The RPS is available to users 96% of the time			2010-09-17
			2012	The RPS is available to users 96% of the time			2010-09-17
			2013	The RPS is available to users 97% of the time			2010-09-17
			2014	The RPS is available to users 97% of the time			2010-09-17
			2015	The RPS is available to users 98% of the time			2010-09-17
Processes and Activities	Security	The number of weeks it takes to respond to high, medium and low categories of POA&M items.	annual	# weeks	Decrease	Respond to 'high' category POA&M items within 4 weeks, 'medium' within 12 weeks and 'low' within 48 weeks	2005-10-01

Fiscal Year	Target	Actual Results	Target "Met" or "Not Met"	Last Updated
2009	Respond to 'high' category POA&M items within 4 weeks, 'medium' within 12 weeks and 'low' within 48 weeks	POA&M responses were within targeted time for high, medium, and low items	Met	2010-09-17
2010	Respond to 'high' category POA&M items within 4 weeks, 'medium' within 12 weeks and 'low' within 48 weeks	POA&M responses were within targeted time for high, medium, and low items	Met	2011-02-18
2011	Respond to 'high' category POA&M items within 3 weeks, 'medium' within 10 weeks and 'low' within 44 weeks			2010-09-17
2012	Respond to 'high' category POA&M items within 3 weeks, 'medium' within 10 weeks and 'low' within 44 weeks			2010-09-17
2013	Respond to 'high' category POA&M items within 2 weeks, 'medium' within 8 weeks and 'low' within 40 weeks			2010-09-17
2014	Respond to 'high' category POA&M items within 2 weeks, 'medium' within 8 weeks and 'low' within 40 weeks			2010-09-17
2015	Respond to 'high' category POA&M items within 1 week, 'medium' within 1 month and 'low' within 1 quarter.			2010-09-17

Technology	Technology Improvement	Time to upgrade RPS software to new versions of vendor supported software for PowerBuilder and Sybase to reduce risk and provide cost effectiveness	annual	years	Decrease	RPS software is upgraded within 2 years of the new version's release date	2005-10-01
			Fiscal Year	Target	Actual Results	Target "Met" or "Not Met"	Last Updated
			2009	RPS software is upgraded within 2 years of the new version's release date	Sybase version upgrades were completed this year and within target.	Met	2010-09-17
			2010	RPS software is upgraded within 2 years of the new version's release date	Sybase version upgrades were completed this year and within target.	Met	2011-02-18
			2011	RPS software is upgraded within 11/2 year of the new version's release date			2010-09-17
			2012	RPS software is upgraded within 11/2 year of the new version's release date			2010-09-17
			2013	RPS software is upgraded within 1 year of the new version's release date			2010-09-17
			2014	RPS software is upgraded within 1 year of the new version's release date			2010-09-17
			2015	RPS software is upgraded within 6 months of the new version's release date			2010-09-17
Mission and Business Results	Program Monitoring	Timeliness and completeness of RPS modifications to align with new regulatory	annual	Percent	Increase	The RPS is 95% compliant with evolving regulatory requirements.	2005-10-01

		requirements.					
			Fiscal Year	Target	Actual Results	Target "Met" or "Not Met"	Last Updated
			2009	The RPS is 95% compliance with evolving regulatory requirements.	RPS was 95% compliant. RPS changes were implemented prior to effective date of new regulatory requirements.	Met	2010-09-17
			2010	The RPS is 95% compliance with evolving regulatory requirements.	RPS was 95% compliant. RPS changes were implemented prior to effective date of new regulatory requirements.	Met	2011-02-18
			2011	The RPS is 96% compliance with evolving regulatory requirements.			2010-09-17
			2012	The RPS is 96% compliance with evolving regulatory requirements.			2010-09-17
			2013	The RPS is 97% compliance with evolving regulatory requirements.			2010-09-17
			2014	The RPS is 97% compliance with evolving regulatory requirements.			2010-09-17
			2015	The RPS is 98% compliance with evolving regulatory requirements.			2010-09-17

* - Indicates data is redacted.